



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/159,404	09/24/1998	CURTIS T. COMBAR	COS-98-044	5086

25537 7590 11/25/2003

WORLDCOM, INC.  
TECHNOLOGY LAW DEPARTMENT  
1133 19TH STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER
----------

HAYES, JOHN W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/159,404

Applicant(s)

COMBAR ET AL.

Examiner

John W Hayes

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 May 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 34.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 24 September 2003 have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive.

Applicant argues that the teachings of Chang and O'Reilly related to entering a request by clicking on text or icons or sending typed inputs to a server does not meet the language of the claims, since selecting icons can not be equated to the metadata as currently claimed. Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Chang (Col. 4, lines 52-55; Col. 5, lines 20-23; Col. 11, lines 10-15; Col. 22, lines 32-40; Col. 23, lines 10-15) teaches a method wherein a requestor application is disclosed enabling the customer to communicate a data report request message via the integrated interface to the report manager server, the request message comprising a metadata description of particular reporting items to be retrieved, the metadata description of particular reporting items being forwarded to the retrieval device, and the retrieval device obtaining customer specific data in accordance with the metadata request. Chang further discloses wherein the user can enter requests by clicking to text or icons or can send typed inputs to the server and receive various reports (Col. 7, lines 5-12; Col. 20, lines 39-46; Col. 21, lines 4-10; Col. 23, lines 10-15) indicating that the requests include data such as metadata. Metadata is defined as "data about data", Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fourth Edition, Microsoft Press, 1999. Examiner submits that the teaching by Chang that the user can enter requests by clicking on text or icons or send typed inputs to a server meets the language of the claims since the text, icons or typed inputs would be data that describes the type of data desired by the user.

Applicant further argues that the references do not teach or suggest "the request message being verified to ensure valid formatting and appropriate parameters for the customer specific data". Examiner respectfully disagrees with this assertion and submits that Chang teaches this feature in accordance with the rejection below.

***Drawings***

2. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on 07 May 2002. These drawings are approved.

***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a. The disclosure has included references to appendices A-I, however, these appendices are not part of the disclosure and will not be included in the published patent. Examiner recommends either incorporating these appendices within the text of disclosure or as drawing figures, See MPEP 608.05(b).

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As per **Claims 1 and 12**, applicant's specification does not reasonably provide adequate support for the newly added recitation of "the request message being verified to ensure valid formatting and appropriate parameters for the customer specific data". Applicants specification discloses that each of the proxy processes further performs a validation process for examining incoming requests and confirming that they include validly formatted messages for the service with acceptable parameters and a translation process for translating a message into an underlying message or networking protocol. Examiner submits that this teaching in applicant's specification appears to be related to examining incoming requests for valid formatting that would comply with an acceptable message protocol for the

Art Unit: 3621

service in order to ensure basic successful communications, not necessarily related to appropriate formatting and parameters for customer specific data that is being requested (Specification, page 90 lines 20-30). There is no mention in this passage that the formatting and parameters are in any way related to customer specific data that is being requested, but rather, appears to be related to a specified message protocol or format that would support basic communications with the service.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4, 7-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,958,016 in view of O'Reilly et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,825,769.

As per **Claims 1-4 and 7-11**, Chang et al disclose a web/internet based reporting system for communicating information related to a customer's communication network to a client workstation via an integrated interface comprising:

- a client browser application located at the client workstation for enabling interactive web based communications with the reporting system, the client workstation identified with a customer and providing the integrated interface (Figure 2; Col. 4, lines 45-51; Col. 5, lines 10-14; Col. 6, lines 28-30; Col. 7, lines 9-13),

- at least one secure server for managing client sessions over the Internet, the secure server supporting secure socket connection enabling encrypted communication between the browser application client and the secure server (Col. 5, lines 1-6; Col. 5 line 61-Col. 6 line 3; Col. 7, lines 36-42; Col. 24, lines 37-45),

Art Unit: 3621

- a report manager server in communication with the at least one secure server for maintaining an inventory of reporting items associated with a customer, the reporting items comprising report data types for reports to be generated for the customer (Figure 1; Col. 10, lines 44-48; Col. 11, lines 4-8; Col. 16, lines 17-38; Col. 19, lines 6-12; Col. 21, lines 62-65; Col. 22, lines 40-50; Col. 23, lines 19-28),

- a data retrieval device for retrieving customer specific data from the customer's telecommunications network at pre-determined times (Col. 19, lines 5-12; Col. 21, lines 55-60; Col. 22, lines 34-42; Col. 23, lines 12-16),

- a requestor application enabling the customer to communicate a data report request message via the integrated interface to the report manager server, the request message being verified to ensure valid formatting and appropriate parameters for the customer specific data (Col. 20 line 39-Col. 21 line 17), the request message comprising a metadata description of particular reporting items to be retrieved, the metadata description of particular reporting items being forwarded to the retrieval device, and the retrieval device obtaining customer specific data in accordance with the metadata request (Col. 4, lines 52-55; Col. 5, lines 20-23; Col. 7, lines 5-12; Col. 11, lines 10-15; Col. 20, lines 39-46; Col. 21, lines 4-10; Col. 22, lines 32-40; Col. 23, lines 10-15),

- whereby the customer specific retrieved data of the reporting items are communicated to the client workstation and utilized to generate a completed report for presentation to the customer (Col. 15, lines 3-6; Col. 19, lines 5-12; Col. 21, lines 62-65; Col. 22, lines 42-48; Col. 23, lines 20-28).

Chang et al, however, fail to specifically disclose that the system communicates call detail information to the customer and that the requestor application allows the customer to specify the particular reporting items to be retrieved for certain predetermined times. O'Reilly et al disclose a system and method for viewing in real time or at other predetermined times call traffic of a telecommunications network wherein the system communicates call detail information to a customer (Col. 15, lines 7-25; Col. 19, lines 57-67; Col. 20, lines 53-61; Col. 22, lines 35-45, Col. 22 line 65-Col. 23 line 9). O'Reilly et al further disclose that the customer uses an application to request specific reporting items to be retrieved at certain specific times (Col. 22 line 65-Col. 23 line 9; Col. 2, lines 47-56; Col. 6, lines 15-45; Col. 23, lines 54-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Chang et al

Art Unit: 3621

and include the ability to provide call detail information to the customer in a format requested by the customer and at times prescribed by the customer as taught by O'Reilly et al. O'Reilly provides motivation by indicating that these features would allow the customer to monitor the operation of the network and accordingly reallocate his resources (Col. 2, lines 30-40). O'Reilly et al further indicates that these features provides the customer the ability to download information from the system in his own format and design for the reports so that a customer can monitor the operation of the network so as to be able to effect any necessary changes expeditiously (Col. 3, lines 12-25).

Chang et al further fail to specifically disclose wherein the report is dynamically determined based on one or more of customization options and user options. O'Reilly et al disclose a system and method for viewing in real time or at other predetermined times call traffic report information and further disclose the ability to obtain a probe report based on user customization options such as specific periods of time or a specific date (Col. 5 line 57-Col. 6 line 5), or wherein the subscriber may access the TVS system to retrieve data which the subscribers can then format or design their own reports (Col. 6, lines 38-46; Col. 6 line 64-Col. 7 line 15; Col. 18 lines 55-67; Col. 22 line 65-Col. 23 line 9). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Chang et al and include the ability to generate the report dynamically based on customization options or user options as taught by O'Reilly. The motivation would be to provide flexibility in the generation of reports so that the subscriber would be able to see a report that meets his/her desires.

As per **Claims 12-17**, Chang et al disclose a web/internet based reporting method for communicating information related to a customer's communication network to a client workstation via an integrated interface comprising:

- enabling interactive web based communications between a client workstation identified with a customer and one or more secure servers over a secure communications link, the web based communications including forwarding of report request messages and associated report response messages back over the secure communications link (Figure 2; Col. 4, lines 45-51; Col. 5, lines 10-14; Col. 6, lines 28-30; Col. 21, lines 50-65; Col. 22, lines 32-47, Col. 23, lines 10-27),

Art Unit: 3621

- accessing reporting items based on a customer entitlement information for a requested report to be generated (Figure 1; Col. 10, lines 44-48; Col. 11, lines 4-8; Col. 16, lines 17-38; Col. 19, lines 6-12; Col. 21, lines 62-65; Col. 22, lines 40-50; Col. 23, lines 19-28),

- generating a response message including a metadata description of particular reporting items to be retrieved, the metadata description of particular reporting items being forwarded to the retrieval device, and the retrieval device obtaining customer specific data in accordance with the metadata request (Col. 4, lines 52-55; Col. 5, lines 20-23; Col. 7, lines 5-12; Col. 11, lines 10-15; Col. 20, lines 39-46; Col. 21, lines 4-10; Col. 22, lines 32-40; Col. 23, lines 10-15),

- verifying the request message to ensure valid formatting and appropriate parameters for the reporting items (Col. 20 line 39-Col. 21 line 17),

- retrieving customer specific data from the customer's telecommunications network in accordance with the reporting items included in the metadata description (Col. 19, lines 5-12; Col. 21, lines 55-60; Col. 22, lines 34-42; Col. 23, lines 12-16),

- whereby the customer specific retrieved data of the reporting items are communicated to the client workstation and utilized to generate a completed report for presentation to the customer (Col. 15, lines 3-6; Col. 19, lines 5-12; Col. 21, lines 62-65; Col. 22, lines 42-48; Col. 23, lines 20-28).

Chang et al, however, fail to specifically disclose that the system communicates call detail information to the customer and that the requestor application allows the customer to specify the particular reporting items to be retrieved. O'Reilly et al disclose a system and method for viewing in real time or at other predetermined times call traffic of a telecommunications network wherein the system communicates call detail information to a customer (Col. 15, lines 7-25; Col. 19, lines 57-67; Col. 20, lines 53-61; Col. 22, lines 35-45, Col. 22 line 65-Col. 23 line 9). O'Reilly et al further disclose that the customer uses an application to request specific reporting items to be retrieved or polled at certain specific times (Col. 22 line 65-Col. 23 line 9; Col. 2, lines 47-56; Col. 6, lines 15-45; Col. 23, lines 54-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Chang et al and include the ability to provide call detail information to the customer in a format requested by the customer and at times prescribed by the customer as taught by O'Reilly et al. O'Reilly provides motivation by indicating that



Art Unit: 3621

these features would allow the customer to monitor the operation of the network and accordingly reallocate his resources (Col. 2, lines 30-40). O'Reilly et al further indicates that these features provides the customer the ability to download information from the system in his own format and design for the reports so that a customer can monitor the operation of the network so as to be able to effect any necessary changes expeditiously (Col. 3, lines 12-25).

Chang et al further fail to specifically disclose wherein the report is dynamically determined based on one or more of customization options and user options. O'Reilly et al disclose a system and method for viewing in real time or at other predetermined times call traffic report information and further disclose the ability to obtain a probe report based on user customization options such as specific periods of time or a specific date (Col. 5 line 57-Col. 6 line 5), or wherein the subscriber may access the TVS system to retrieve data which the subscribers can then format or design their own reports (Col. 6, lines 38-46; Col. 6 line 64-Col. 7 line 15; Col. 18 lines 55-67; Col. 22 line 65-Col. 23 line 9). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Chang et al and include the ability to generate the report dynamically based on customization options or user options as taught by O'Reilly. The motivation would be to provide flexibility in the generation of reports so that the subscriber would be able to see a report that meets his/her desires.

As per **Claim 19**, Chang et al further disclose the step of supporting encrypted communication of report request messages and report response messages between the client application and a secure server over the communications link (Col. 5, lines 1-6; Col. 5 line 61-Col. 6 line 3; Col. 7, lines 36-42; Col. 24, lines 37-45).

8. Claims 5-6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,958,016 and O'Reilly et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,825,769 as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Sharples et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,240,450 B1.

As per **Claims 5-6 and 18**, Chang et al and O'Reilly et al fail to specifically disclose a requestor applet that further enables customer scheduling of report request descriptions to be communicated from the report manager to the retrieval device at a customer specified frequency or wherein the secure web server further generates report requestor applets capable of presenting the reporting items to the customer via the report requestor application. Sharples et al disclose a network data visualization system and method for visualizing data related to traffic statistics in a communications network and teaches the use of applets (Col. 4, lines 23-37) to enable the customer to schedule the reporting of the information at a customer specified frequency (Col. 6 lines 51-Col. 7 line 30) and wherein the secure server further generates applets capable of presenting the reporting items to a customer (Col. 5, lines 45-67; Col. 8, lines 15-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the methods of Chang et al and O'Reilly et al and include the use of applets to enable the customer to schedule the reporting of the information and presenting it to the customer. Sharples et al provides motivation by indicating that this provides an effective means to enable non-technical customers to retrieve data presentation and access software at the time of data access (Col. 3, lines 1-6 and 40-50). Sharples et al also indicates that if the data relates to traffic statistics in a communications network, then the system is particularly useful for the service provider who can monitor almost in real time the success or otherwise of a particular communications service (Col. 3, lines 5-10).

### ***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3621

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

11. The prior art previously made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Pullen et al disclose a system and method for monitoring telecommunications equipment using enhanced Internet access and teaches wherein personnel may click on an access option displayed on a home page that executes a Java applet to perform different functions such as requesting specific data or information from a services element server
- Jagadish et al disclose a method and system for providing online access to automatically generating billing information periodically, on a predetermined schedule or upon demand by the customer
- Buhler et al disclose a method for gathering billing information for Internet telephony including call detail reports
- Scholl et al disclose a web based network management gateway wherein requests from web clients are processed to interact with communications systems and their managed objects to obtain information from the managed objects and communicate that information back to the web client
- Cogger et al disclose an integrated interface for web based customer care and trouble management and teach the use of a web browser to generate call detail reports, call usage analysis information and network traffic analysis/monitor information

Art Unit: 3621

- Lagarde et al disclose a web based system using intelligent agents for providing reports to a customer.

Web clients request a report and specify the parameters to used in generating a report, a processing agent and a server retrieve, process and format the report information which is then presented to the user on the Web.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Hayes whose telephone number is (703)306-5447. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 5:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jim Trammell, can be reached on (703) 305-9768.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington D.C. 20231***

or faxed to:

**(703) 872-9306** [Official communications; including  
After Final communications labeled  
"Box AF"]

**(703) 746-5531** [Informal/Draft communications, labeled  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington,  
VA, 7<sup>th</sup> floor receptionist.

  
John W. Hayes  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3621

November 23, 2003